

Appl. No. 10/054,628
Atty. Docket No. 7571RD
Reply Dated April 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2006
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-11 have been listed above in the section entitled "Amendments to the Claims." However, no amendments have been made to the claims in this response. The claims are relisted to clarify what claims are pending. Applicant incorrectly identified the number of pending claims in the reply sent on October 27, 2005 and the supplemental amendment sent on October 28, 2005. The eleven pending claims were initially presented in the amendment and request for continued examination submitted on May 16, 2005.

These changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Office has provisionally rejected Claim 1-3 on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1, 2, 4, and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,054. In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, accompanying this Reply is a terminal disclaimer filed in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c). In light of the terminal disclaimer, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. In view of the foregoing, allowance of Claims 1 - 11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By



Eric T. Addington
Registration No. 52,403
(513) 634-1602

Date: April 3, 2006
Customer No. 27752